

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Claim 22 has been amended so as to obviate the objection thereto. Please note that claim 22 in its amended form is of the same scope as is originally filed claim 22.

Claims 6, 13, 20, 27, 33 and 39 have each been amended so as to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection thereof. Specifically, each of these claims has been amended so as to depend from a claim that recites “a first tubular extension”.

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Motl et al., and the remaining claims were indicated to contain allowable subject matter. The indication of allowable subject matter is greatly appreciated; however, allowable claim 36 has not been rewritten in independent form because, originally filed claim 35 and amended claim 35 are believed to be allowable over Motl et al. for the following reasons.

Initially, the rejection of claim 35 is respectfully traversed, because element 50 in Motl et al. is not a “cover” as recited in claim 35, but is rather disclosed to be a bracket. Also, this bracket 50 does not cover opening 26 in casing 12, but rather opening 26 is covered with seal 78. Thus, for this reason claim 35 as originally filed, and as amended, is not anticipated by Motl et al.

Irrespective of the above, to further distinguish claim 35 from Motl et al., this claim has been amended to require that the passageway is to be *aligned with a mesh point between gear teeth* and that the passageway is constructed and arranged to *supply oil forced from the mesh point*.

Each of these additional features is not taught or suggested by Motl et al. In this regard, passageway 152/154 in Motl et al., as identified by the Examiner, is not aligned with any mesh point but is rather aligned with passages 150 and 155 so as to interconnect passages 152 and 154 with oil retainer 148. Oil is supplied to bore 156 in output shaft 28 from oil retainer 148 via passages 150, 155, 152 and 154, which retainer catches oil that is thrown outwardly by rotating gears. Thus, oil flows into passage 150 from oil retainer 148, as opposed to being forced into this passage from any mesh point between gears. Thus, for this additional reason amended claim 35 is not anticipated by Motl et al., whereby claim 35 is allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Nobuki Hasegawa et al.

By:


Joseph M. Gorski

Registration No. 46,500

Attorney for Applicants

JMG/edg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 3, 2005